

**COMMON AGENDA**  
**TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2003**  
**8:30 a.m.**  
**COUNTY-CITY BUILDING - ROOM 113**

**I. MINUTES**

A. Minutes of Common Meeting of February 10, 2003

**II. PRESENTATIONS**

*8:30 a.m.* A. PW/State Department of Roads - The West By-Pass Study Report - (Plus a South Beltway Update) (Moderator- Monty Fredrickson) - *45 Min*

*9:15 a.m.* B. Report from the 02-21-03 Meeting regarding the proposed position for a Joint City/County Employee in the Council/Commissioners Offices. (Jonathan Cook/Kerry Eagan) -*10 Min*

*9:25 a.m.* C. Discussion of May Common Meeting Schedule (Normally scheduled date is Election Day - Planning needs to update Common Members on the Comp Plan Annual Review in May - Reschedule Date?)

**III 9:30 a.m. ADJOURNMENT**

# COMMON MEETING MINUTES

March 4, 2003- 8:30a.m.

County-City Building  
Conference Room 113

*COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:* Ken Svoboda, Common Chair, Jon Camp (arrived late); Jonathan Cook (arrived late); Glenn Friendt; Coleen Seng; Terry Werner **COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:** Annette McRoy; *MAYOR WESELY:* In Attendance (arrived late]

*COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:* Larry Hudkins; Bernie Heier; Deb Schorr; Bob Workman; *COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:* Ray Stevens, Common Vice-Chair

*OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:* - Mike Carlin, Dick Esseks (Friends of Wilderness Park); Monty Fredrickson; Lou Lenzan, (State Department of Roads); Mike Malone, Olsson & Associates; Mike Foreman of the South Beltway Design Team; Jerry Shoecraft, City Council Candidate; Staff, Members of the Public and Media Representatives.

## I. MINUTES

### 1) Common Meeting of Monday, February 10, 2003

Chair Ken Svoboda opened the meeting and called for approval of the above-listed minutes. Larry Hudkins moved approval of the minutes, as presented. Coleen Seng seconded the motion which carried by the following vote: AYES: Glenn Friendt, Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins, Deb Schorr, Coleen Seng, Ken Svoboda, Terry Werner, Bob Workman; NAYS: None; ABSENT FOR VOTE: Mayor Wesely, Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook; ABSENT: Annette McRoy, Ray Stevens

## THIS MEETING WAS SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS:

THE WEST BY-PASS STUDY REPORT - PLUS A SOUTH BELTWAY UPDATE

REPORT FROM THE 02-21-03 MEETING REGARDING THE PROPOSED POSITION FOR A JOINT CITY/COUNTY EMPLOYEE IN THE COUNCIL/COMMISSIONERS OFFICES.

DISCUSSION OF MAY COMMON MEETING SCHEDULE

THE WEST BY-PASS STUDY REPORT - PLUS A SOUTH BELTWAY UPDATE - Mr. Monty Fredrickson of the Nebraska Department of Roads introduced Mr. Mike Malone of Olsson & Associates stating that they had two projects to present today. They would begin with the West By-Pass and then offer a brief up-date on the South Beltway.

Mr. Fredrickson passed out a map of the West By-Pass based on a study by Olsson & Associates which covered the area from Van Dorn to Saltillo Road. He noted that Mr. Malone would give the results of that study. Mr. Fredrickson explained that the purpose of the study had been to figure out how to upgrade that portion of the by-pass to a freeway. That would mean there would be no at-grade intersections. Given the South Beltway approval, and its design as a freeway from Highway 2 to Saltillo, that will all be interchanges. Also, given that we connect to the interstate with an interchange, hopefully, with money available, we'll be able to build the interchange at Captiol Parkway West and the By-Pass in 2005. We have an interchange at Van Dorn, so then we have this segment from Van Dorn to Saltillo that we feel needs to be, in the future, upgraded to a freeway standard, thus completing that freeway loop around the south and west part of Lincoln.

Mr. Malone reported that he would discuss the Highway 77 Corridor study, which defines corridor protection along that portion of Highway 77 within the study corridor. Specifically looking at three locations (Warlick, Pioneers Boulevard and Old Cheney) we studied interchange options at Warlick and Pioneers as well as closure options and over-pass options at Old Cheney and Pioneers.

He noted that a couple of key study assumptions which he wished to review prior to the presentation of the actual study results included one in which -for the purposes of this study- Yankee Hill Road and Rokeby Road at Highway 77 were assumed to be closed. In terms of traffic modeling projections gathered from our traffic analysis, we assumed those two at-grade intersections, as they exist today, would be closed in the future. That does not preclude that the City or the County or someone else might come back in the future and study other options there in terms of some sort of connection, whether an over-pass or interchange, or whatever. But for the purposes of this study, these roads are assumed to be closed.

He reported that early in the study, they had looked at an interchange at Old Cheney Road and concluded, from a traffic standpoint, an interchange was not warranted as the roadways surrounding that area would function without an interchange. There is also not sufficient spacing between Warlick Boulevard. and Old Cheney Road to provide the type of spacing that the State would desire for urban areas. The ramps and the ramp roadways would be closer than desirable standards. In addition to that, there would be some floodplain impacts and some environmental impacts with Wilderness Park. So, for a variety of reasons, an interchange at Old Cheney Road was eliminated from consideration fairly early in the study process. This gave us the opportunity to really focus on the over-pass option or closure at that roadway.

In terms of the study findings, which were based primarily on traffic analysis data, the existing corridor does operate on an acceptable level of service today. We defined "acceptable level of service" as C or better. There are some existing accident rates at Warlick Boulevard and Old Cheney Road that do exceed the State-wide average accident rate for similar facility types....so there is some accident history and there are some accident patterns occurring in the study area. In the future, with no improvements, the intersections and this study corridor would not operate at acceptable levels of service anymore, with the levels of service deteriorating to Service Levels E and F for the majority of the movements at these intersections.

However, with the recommended improvements that will be reviewed here today, it was found that acceptable operations can be maintained at all of these study area intersections.

The study Recommendations then, very briefly, included an interchange recommendation at Warlick Boulevard; a closure of Old Chaney Road and also an interchange is recommended at Pioneers Boulevard. For the two interchange locations - the intersection geometrics with the [inaudible] configurations would include dual left turn lanes, and exclusive right turn lanes on each of the intersections or approach roadways. The bridge structure that would go over the interchange would include a four-lane roadway section.

A series of slides was shown with a little more detail about the options that were considered at each of the locations:

**At Warlick Boulevard** - They had looked at alignment modifications of West Denton Road and South 1<sup>st</sup> Street. There are going to be some right-of-way impacts to the northeast quadrant of this intersection area. A fairly significant utility relocation with a major over-head power line is something that will be considered during the design stage. The preliminary construction cost estimate for this improvement is approximately \$10,250,000. The recommended concept based on the conceptual design shows Warlick Boulevard running along east/west with necessary connection realignments with West Denton Road and 1<sup>st</sup> Street. The redesign would also accommodate the two interchange ramp roadways. The right-of-way impact is small; a portion of the northeast corner of the intersection will provide the right-of-way for the ramp roadway. This would also include dual left turn lanes and a four-lane roadway across this structure.

**Old Cheney Road** - There will be a connection between 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Old Cheney Road with a closure option on the east side of Highway 77. On the west side, there will be some sort of a cul-de-sac or turn-around so that the vehicles in that location would have the ability to turn around, but the road would not go across. The preliminary construction cost estimate for that improvement is about \$80,000.00 - much less than the interchange option, because it basically consists of the removal of existing at-grade intersections and minor roadway modifications.

Advantages/Disadvantages of Old Cheney Options:

Number of Advantages with the Closure Option:

- 1) Reduced Construction and Utility Costs
- 2) No Environmental Impacts to Wilderness Park as with the Interchange/Overpass Options
- 3) No Right-of-Way Impacts
- 4) Reduced Vehicle/Train Conflicts because of reduced traffic volumes on Old Cheney Road

Disadvantage with Closure Option:

- 1) This will reduce the continuity of the roadway system in this area. (Taking of a road that crosses the Interstate and provides some continuity in overall roadway connections to that portion of the City will be eliminated)

This disadvantage would be off-set, based on our analysis; Van Dorn, Warlick and Pioneers would offer three good alternatives that would provide the necessary connections.

The presentation continued with slides showing the closure option and how that design would be incorporated into the roadway system.

At Pioneers Boulevard there are two property acquisitions in the northeast quadrant of the intersection that would be required based on the recommended improvement.

Some alignment alternatives had been looked at, but eventually it was decided to maintain the existing alignment. There are minimum environmental impacts with any of the interchange or overpass options that were reviewed. There is a significant utility relocation costs similar to the Warlick Boulevard intersection. As the options were reviewed, there were some spacing considerations with the interchange ramp roadways as well as the Folsom Street intersection to the left which were included in the evaluation and recommendation of the preferred alternative. The preliminary construction cost estimate for this alternative is about \$10,400,000.

The recommended alternative would require the acquisition of two properties as part of this project. The maintaining of the current roadway alignment was chosen in order to try to maintain the existing intersection without creating additional alignment impacts to the YMCA Soccer Fields. Ultimately, we recommended sticking with the existing roadway alignment.

That basically concludes the Highway 77 portion of the presentation. Mr. Malone stated that he did want to clarify that the construction cost does include the anticipated right-of-way acquisition required for the recommended option, and the utility re-location cost, but does not include engineering construction management work that would be required to move these projects to the next level. With that, Mr. Malone opened the floor to questions from the Common Members.

Mr. Heier stated that he was not a road expert, but he wondered why we would close roads that we have open already...this thought pertaining particularly to Old Cheney, since this road already connects the West Lincoln area. Is there no anticipation that West Lincoln will grow? He stated that he was a great believer in keeping the streets that we have.

A staff member answered that the traffic model assumed land use for the build-out scenario for West Lincoln, so it assumes full development based on current land use assumptions. The traffic results and the traffic projections show that those existing roadways would function without Old Cheney Road; that road traffic would, basically, be diverted to Warlick, Pioneers or Van Dorn. There is no intent to not plan for the future growth of that area. We expect that future growth can be accommodated without that connection.

Mr. Heier stated that he just sees the problems we have at the present time with some of our road systems and no through streets. This is obviously a through street that will be just cut off.

Mr. Hudkins stated that would be his concern as well. He noted that Old Cheney carries a lot of traffic. He assumed that with a full interchange on Pioneers, that will help with the ballfields and as the Optimists purchase their land to the south of Old Cheney....that is heavily used there as well. He re-stated the fact that he would really have some concerns with closing Old Cheney. He noted that as far as the environmental impacts, (we do have Wilderness Park there which the County does own), but it would be minimal impact. There is no development there. It is not a major portion of the park, and there are no buildings that would have to be moved. He would have great concern about closing a major thorough-fare road as we service that area, which will continue to grow.

He continued, noting that he understood the cost of an overpass over the West By-Pass now, but could an alternative design be brought forward that would keep Old Cheney open? Discussion regarding this concern continued briefly with the engineering experts stating that they had not thought the interchange would warrant staying open from a traffic standpoint, so a full range of interchange alternatives had not been investigated because of the spacing consideration and other things.

It was noted that the other element that had not been mentioned is that Old Cheney Road and Warlick are less than a quarter of a mile apart and eventually connect at an intersection which is currently somewhat of a problem intersection today. The two road-ways are somewhat redundant and Warlick carries the lion's share of traffic now.

Discussion continued for a time with staff offering further explanation for the recommendation of closure, a decision with which Mr. Roger Figard stated the City's Public Works Department and the State Department of Roads concurred. He noted this was deemed to be a good alternative to the widening of Old Cheney, the building of an over-pass over the railroad tracks, and getting through the Park and having the interchange out there - all of which would have been a formidable challenge. Mr. Figard added that the Long Range Transportation Plan provides other alternative routes into that southwest quadrant. Traffic analysis says we can get traffic in and out with this option and Staff would encourage your support of this alternative recommendation.

Mr. Friendt commented, that as Bernie and Larry pointed out, they're not really engineers. [Laughter]. He noted that this looks like a good plan, remembering that the goal is for the West By-Pass to be a freeway. You can't have a freeway if every half-mile there is an intersection. The question is do we want it to be a freeway? If there are at-grade intersections on a freeway, there is a higher risk of accidents.

Ms. Schorr asked if the studies took into consideration the ballfield traffic? She stated that it is horrible now and she cannot imagine closing another road. There are thousands of cars from three o'clock 'til the sun sets, seven nights a week, nine months out of the year. It's horrible now...when you say "traffic patterns", you're not just talking residential traffic, but, you have included the high volume that comes in because of the ballfield traffic? In response to her question, it was noted that the land uses for the ballfield were plugged into the traffic model. There had been some special counts on evenings and Saturdays and Sundays as well, so these conditions were noted.

Mr. Werner questioned if it might be feasible to have ramps between Warlick and Old Cheney given the spacing? It was explained that spacing would be too close for an interchange. Mr. Werner noted that he could not even imagine wanting to place an interchange there, adding that, in agreement with Mr. Friendt's comments, we are building a beltway that we want to be a freeway. He noted the interchanges would be located at Warlick, Pioneers, Van Dorn, Capital Parkway and "O" Street as the major interchanges on the freeway. He asked if that were a standard number of interchanges into a City the size of Lincoln? The engineers stated that it was, noting that the desirable spacing is two miles. This spacing within this segment would be a little less than that on average, so it isn't a big compromise, but you wouldn't want to have a lot more interchanges spaced within that area. Mr. Werner asked if it would be a safety hazard to have more interchanges in the area. The answer to that question was yes - safety would be compromised.

Mr. Workman stated that at 'first blush', it looks like a great idea. He noted that the intersection at Old Cheney & Warlick is a five road intersection. He commented that he has witnessed the congestion of the Cotner Boulevard, Randolph and 56<sup>th</sup> Streets intersection, and knows what kind of a monster that turned into. There were too many roads meeting at one point. He stated that he liked the idea of Old Cheney being closed near Wilderness Park. All the other by-passes that have been approved have an interchange every two miles. This fits into that idea. He felt this design would work.

Discussion continued with Common members touching on such concerns as traffic flow and volume compared with Omaha; people who have invested in new businesses and residential property in the area of Old Cheney Road; and whether or not 1<sup>st</sup> Street was within the City Limits between Old Cheney & Pioneers Boulevard. [It is County property, though County Board Members offered to give it to the City - amid laughter].

Mr. Svoboda asked if there were any long-range plans for 1<sup>st</sup> Street - even placing it in a Rural Paving District. It was noted that if Old Cheney is closed, it would have to be changed somehow, because that would be the only way out to go north to Pioneers. Staff stated that it will be improved, but probably only within the next five years.

Mr. Monty Fredrickson commented that the study is completed and they are ready to "go public" with it. They would like to have a public information meeting within the next month or so to present these ideas to the public. The immediate purpose is to land on a scheme of consensus. The major concern is protecting the right-of-way near Warlick for that interchange and the flattening out of the West Denton Road. We need to file corridor protection so that we can build that facility when the time comes.

Mr. Hudkins noted, for the record, that Warlick is not less than a quarter of a mile, but is three-quarters of a mile from the at-grade intersection where it is now to where Warlick closes with Highway 77.

Mr. Svoboda requested Mr. Malone to copy off the power point presentation for the County and City offices. Mr. Malone indicated that he would do so.

UPDATE ON THE SOUTH BELTWAY: Mr. Malone introduced Mr. Mike Foreman of the Hoskins, Western and HDR Team whose members are working to form the preliminary Design on the South Beltway. The State Department of Roads has taken the lead in the development of that project in the preliminary design phase, as the City was the lead through the Environmental and Feasibility process. This consultant team has been working diligently with the State and City and County officials to develop the design for this facility.

Mr. Foreman went through the update. He stated that the actual design phase of the South Beltway began in September of this last year. One of the first things we did was take the whole Beltway, which connects Highway 2 on the east side to Highway 77 on the west. We took the whole beltway and broke it up into three segments. That was so we could work on the three segments concurrently and get it designed as quickly as possible. In looking at the segments, the west segment goes from Highway 77 to approx. 27<sup>th</sup> Street; the middle segment goes from 27<sup>th</sup> Street to just past 84<sup>th</sup> Street; the east segment goes from 84<sup>th</sup> Street out to Highway 2. In moving forward with this project, we decided to put our greatest emphasis on the middle segment because it has the least amount of complications to it. That alignment was pretty well set during the Environmental Impact process. The two system interchanges on either end are still having some of the concepts refined.

Mr. Foreman showed slides which included overviews of the middle segment showing an extension of 27<sup>th</sup> Street to the South Beltway where there is a diamond type interchange. There is also an extension of 68<sup>th</sup> Street where there is also an interchange; and an 84<sup>th</sup> to 82<sup>nd</sup> Street connection, also with an interchange. The design process will include the interchanges, the main line of the beltway, and also the extension of those streets.

He stated that the plan was to have a “plan-in-hand” field trip scheduled for next week (assuming the weather is good). That is where we go out and actually walk the route and look at all the specific details of the route. We’ve developed the plans to the 30% stage. Now we need to go out and look things over and make sure everything, including our assumptions, are correct. There is a public hearing scheduled for this spring where people will come in to look over the plans. That will be a public hearing where everyone can review the plans.

The next segment to be worked on will be the East connection which is to Highway 2. There we have a system interchange that will include existing Highway 2 as it diagonals to the downtown, and Highway 2 to the East, with the South Beltway. He noted that they were also aware that there is going to be a future East Beltway connection, so the concepts we’re developing are really a refinement of what we did in the EIS. What we’re looking at now in terms of refinement is whether or not we have the right number of lanes for the individual movements, etc....just to make sure that we are accommodating future traffic.

The East Beltway design is such that we’re accommodating future East Beltway with a minimum amount of re-build. A “plan-in-hand” for that project is going to be scheduled for this summer and the public hearing will be conducted in the fall.

Finally, the West end, where we connect to Highway 77. Many will recall that this concept includes connections to Saltillo Road from both the South Beltway and Highway 77. We are, again, in the process of just defining the concept in terms of number of lanes and so on. Again, like the east system interchange, we’re planning a “plan-in-hand” field trip in this summer and a public hearing to be conducted in the fall.

Mr. Werner asked about the State taking over....is that true for the East Beltway? The State representative indicated that there is no agreement at this point. Mr. Werner asked then if the City were still taking the lead on that project.

Mr. Workman asked about the “plan-in-hand” tour and a field trip on the East Beltway, wondering then if it was known exactly where that East Beltway will be. Mr. Fredricksen stated that he was sorry...he did not mean to say that. The East System *interchange*, where the South Beltway connects with Highway 2, will have a “plan-in-hand” field trip, not the East Beltway. There is nothing on the East Beltway at this time. The only thing being done is an attempt to accommodate future plans, should it be constructed.

Mr. Camp noted that there seemed to be an absence of interchanges along the South Beltway - especially from 82<sup>nd</sup> Street to 120<sup>th</sup> Streets - for almost four miles, there is no connection onto that. Is this something where, down the road, we might see the addition of an interchange? Or will we have a four-mile segment with no access? Mr. Fredrickson noted that when you look at the topography of that diagonal connection from 84<sup>th</sup> over to Highway 2, there really isn't a good way to get an interchange in there. The roadway doesn't have a good connection through the town of Cheney. It's not continuous and so would serve a relatively minor amount of traffic. As we began the process with the EIS a number of years ago, we did start with the two mile spacing as just a general concept. We simply did not find a location within the 82<sup>nd</sup> to Highway 2 area that an interchange could be put in....one which would be worth the investment. That's why there isn't one there.

Mr. Camp asked about the East/West connection along Saltillo Road, especially at the 96<sup>th</sup> Street area - will there be a continuous East/West path there? Mr. Fredrickson answered that currently there is a jog from Saltillo across the South Beltway and then back up to Saltillo. Right now, in the current design, we are showing a jog of Saltillo Road at 96<sup>th</sup> Street - so 96<sup>th</sup> would be continuous through there. That is the plan in the Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Camp indicated that his wish would be to continue a traffic flow across the City.

In Mr. Camp's last question regarding the Highway 2 connection and Highway 77, he noted that it resembles a pile of spaghetti. His concern of land use would reflect the thought of a lot of concrete ribbons there. He asked if that much is necessary? The answer from the engineers was “yes.”. It was explained that in order to get the access to Saltillo from both the South Beltway and from Highway 77, a lot of those roadways were necessary. Maybe those additional ramps are the result of this complexity. In the process of developing the environmental document, this ramp pattern was felt to be necessary in order to accommodate traffic that is already there and to allow businesses along Saltillo to remain open. The East end is under some review at this point regarding our concept development for the system interchanges. What is shown is the design which is in the EIS. Some of the designs may change slightly, so you should be aware of that. The general footprint will stay the same, but some of the ramps shown may be slightly different when completed.

It was noted that the railroad tracks had been a consideration when the design was drawn up. Mr. Heier expressed his concern that the definitions of *beltway*, *by-pass* and *expressway* all be adequately clarified; and his concern that the interchanges at 66<sup>th</sup>, 82<sup>nd</sup>, and 84<sup>th</sup> Street eventually crossing Highway 2 had no other intersection being shown until 96<sup>th</sup> Street. It was explained that the terms “beltway” and “by-pass” are used interchangeably. They are terms to denote a roadway the skirts the edge of a City or goes around the entire City. The technical terms for highways of this nature are either ‘expressway’ or ‘freeway’. An expressway has at-grade intersections and can have signals; a freeway has no signals, no at-grade intersections and all access is from interchanges. The Interstate is a freeway and Highway 77 from Lincoln to Beatrice is an expressway. This beltway is being designed as a freeway so it will look like an interstate. We want to upgrade the West By-pass to that same status someday to complete this route.

Mr. Figard noted that, regarding 96<sup>th</sup> Street, in the current 25 Year Long-Range Transportation Plan, with the proposed growth areas and with the proposed population growth, we don't show 98<sup>th</sup> Street as needing a significant improvement at this point in time. Each time we annually update the Comp Plan, and Lincoln grows, you could see 98<sup>th</sup> Street become a future road project; but right now, the long range plan



over 25 years, with estimated population growth, doesn't show a need for a four-lane road until it gets outside of the urban future growth area. There will be some problems in that area in getting over Highway 2 because Cheney is there. As Lincoln grows and the urban boundaries expand, each of the mile line roads would be analyzed and could be added to a new long-range plan proposing improvements that would have to be looked at. ... to determine whether or not an interchange or an access to either Highway 2 or Highway 6, or to a beltway is necessary. That would become part of the annual Comp Plan update and the annual review of the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Right now, our growth area doesn't extend that far and doesn't say we need a four lane road in the area between Saltillo and Highway 2. Mr. Heier asked about the areas from 98<sup>th</sup> & Saltillo past Highways 2, 34 and 36 and the Interstate system. Mr. Heier stated that he was worried about how the traffic would get across Highway 2. He wondered if 98<sup>th</sup> Street couldn't be made another through road to get to all three highways. Mr. Figard noted that anything is possible, but 98<sup>th</sup> Street at Highway 2 is outside of the 25 Year Future Service limit in the urban area. He noted that that could change.

At 98<sup>th</sup> and Pine Lake and Highway 2, with that new development, the primary traffic movement comes down 98<sup>th</sup> Street. We have built a new 91<sup>st</sup> Street that comes over and connects to Highway 2. 98<sup>th</sup> Street is really not intended to connect up at Highway 2 just north of Cheney, but traffic will come down the half-mile line through the shopping center where the traffic signal is located at 91<sup>st</sup> Street. South of there, we have two-mile spacing from 84<sup>th</sup> Street over to Highway 2. That triangle of land is not part of the Future Urban Growth Area in the next 25-Year Plan. He noted that, if it were wished, it could be added in. Mr. Heier commented that this would be the City's call. Mr. Svoboda stated that the City would take it under advisement. [Laughter] Mr. Heier asked if there would be bridges planned to cross Highway 2 at these spots. He was assured that there were.

Mr. Cook asked why, at 68<sup>th</sup> Street, the decision wasn't made to jog over to 70<sup>th</sup> since 70<sup>th</sup> is an important connection. The answer was that the heaviest movement was from 54<sup>th</sup> Street over to 68<sup>th</sup> Street and south. So, if the intersection were moved to connect 68<sup>th</sup> over to 70<sup>th</sup>, the traffic would be taken from 54<sup>th</sup> out of their way, so the decision was based on traffic movement needs.

Common Members continued to question various locations and decisions, and the reasoning behind each decision. The presenters patiently explained each question and concern.

The Mayor thanked the Department of Roads for working very quickly on this project. He stated that a number of people had commented to him on how well the Department has taken on this responsibility. On behalf of both the City and County, he expressed appreciation for the Department's quick action on this very important project. He stated this is something that is long over-due, and thanked those present for all they had done to accomplish this goal.

Mr. Cook asked the time-line for the meetings on the South Beltway. It was noted that the accelerated schedule is set out in order to try to take advantage of any federally ear-marked money in this next Six-Year Highway Bill, which they've already begun to talk about. The sooner something could be "put on the street", the better off we'll be in getting money, especially from our Congressmen/Senators. If they can see that we can put the money to work, we'll have a better chance of getting it done. The schedule is set and our goal is to begin construction on some portion of that middle piece in 2004, so we can say - "you give us the money, we can hit the ground running"....with that piece of the project. The schedule indicates that, if somebody gave us enough money, we could finish the project in 2009. That happens to be the end of the Highway Act, and Congress likes to know that we can put this money to use by the end of the Highway Act (as opposed to our still being at the Environmental Statements stage of the process). The EIS was a big step on this project and we're moving ahead and hoping for that money.

Mayor Wesely noted that \$5,000,000 has been ear-marked by Senator Nelson. Even though the budget hasn't been approved, he stated that Lincoln has been approved for \$3,000,000 of that for the year 2003. Now, we have 7.2 million dollars apportioned to Nebraska for this project. The amount will turn into less than that in real money, because Congress has another step which they call Obligation Authority.

Historically, we've only been allowed to spend 90% of the Federal money that they apportion, so 6.3 million dollars might be a better estimate of real money that we will have at our disposal. Mayor Wesely noted that the rest of the funding appears to be available to us because of the project's placement into the budget; and since it is not a "new" project, it is on line for further funding; so hopefully, the rest of the funding will be forthcoming.

#### REPORT FROM THE 02-21-03 MEETING REGARDING THE PROPOSED POSITION FOR A JOINT CITY/COUNTY EMPLOYEE IN THE COUNCIL/COMMISSIONERS OFFICES

Mr. Cook reported on the meeting which had been held several weeks ago with Mr. Eagan, Ms. Beattie, Ms. Grammer, Ms. Ray, Mr. Hudkins, Mr. Camp, Mr. Killeen, Mr. Stevens and himself. The meeting had been called to discuss the space needed for the proposed joint position, and to determine what the needs of this new employee would be, as well as how the costs might be divided between the City and County. Mr. Cook, in accordance with that meeting (and with discussion held previously with the Council), distilled the essence of the meeting into this brief summary:

He noted that some Council Members feel that, perhaps, the County benefits the most from this position since they really need an additional staff member, but it is also a benefit to the City...so there should be some cost sharing. The cost would be shared 75% County/25% City for the employee, while the Space Cost would be shared 50%/50%. The person would be a County Employee. The City would pay the County for its share through an Interlocal Agreement. It had been suggested that Mr. Eagan would serve as a coordinator for both the County and City positions - just to keep track of schedules and such, not necessarily to provide direction. Council would still direct City Staff and County would direct their staff, but it had been agreed that it would be helpful to have a schedule coordinator in case of absences to insure that adequate coverage is always in place.

Mr. Cook reviewed the costs as presented in the numbers that had been provided to the Common Members, noting that the City portion would be approximately \$9,200 and the County portion about \$23,000 per year. Mr. Cook asked for feed-back from the Common members.

Mr. Werner noted that the Building Commission might agree to lower the rent. [Laughter] Discussion of the cost split ensued with Mr. Workman presenting an argument for a 50/50 split. After continued discussion, a decision was made to move forward with the 75/25 split on the hiring of the employee, with County supervision [amended to "coordination" prior to the vote], with a 50/50 split on the space costs. Mr. Heier so moved with Mr. Friendt seconding the motion.

Prior to the vote on the motion, Ms. Seng stated that she was pleased with this effort at consolidation, noting the elected officials should be in the forefront of this effort. Mr. Eagan noted that "the devils will be in the details" of the Interlocal Agreement that must be worked out.

He noted that there were actually two issues, one of which was regarding the space. The configuration of that space will affect how the Council and County Board offices and the staff areas are arranged. Then, secondly, the staffing issue, itself is important. He stated that he felt it was important for the City Council to have their secretary position under the true supervision of the Council. He noted that it would be important that the identities of the Staff positions be maintained.

After having stated that, Mr. Eagan wanted to point out that there are many synergies that can be met in running the office. For instance, there could be one common area with the copy equipment, faxes, etc. That was the original vision when we moved to this building. Mr. Eagan further noted that he was very comfortable with the coordinator concept, because the Supervisor designation, quite frankly, made him a little nervous.

The vote was called on this advisory motion, as amended, and carried by following vote: AYES: Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Glenn Friendt, Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins, Deb Schorr, Coleen Seng, Ken Svoboda, Terry Werner, Bob Workman; NAYS: None; ABSENT FOR VOTE: Mayor Wesely; ABSENT: Annette McRoy, Ray Stevens.

It was noted that Mr. John Kay of Sinclair-Hille was present to answer any questions the Common Members might have regarding the space issues involved in this consolidation process. Mr. Svoboda, in the interest of time, requested that Mr. Kay remain after the meeting to talk with Common Members who might have questions at that time. Mr. Kay graciously agreed to do so.

DISCUSSION OF MAY COMMON MEETING SCHEDULE - Because of the May Common Date falling on Election Day, it was requested that the date, May 6<sup>th</sup>, be reconsidered. After discussion, the Common Members decided to move the May Common date to Tuesday, the 13<sup>th</sup> of May. The meeting is scheduled to immediately follow the Joint LPS/City/County Meeting which is to be held at the North Star High School. The meeting start time was estimated to be approximately 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Svoboda stated that the next meeting date was scheduled for Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m. to be held in Conference Room 113.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT - Mr. Svoboda called for adjournment. The motion was made and seconded and the meeting was declared adjourned at approximately 9:44 a.m.

*Submitted by  
Joan V. Ray  
Council Secretary*